2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

551 This account agrees in details with my own information but is widely at variance on the fundamental point of the range of application of the prohibition. My informants stated emphatically that it applied only to a close group of husband's relatives; in practice, to the occupants of the ylken yj (father's house) and the several otav (junior houses) which would usually surround it, involving the husband's father, mother, unmarried sisters, brothers, brothers' wives and children. Such a group would usually consist of about fifteen or twenty people. Within it the wife might not use the name of any of the husband's male relatives nor those of his mother and sister. Nor might she address by name the wife of an elder brother of her husband although the wife of an elder brother might use the name of a younger brother's wife. Samoĭlovich's statement that a wife may not use the name of the children of the husband's elder male relatives may, according to my information, be somewhat extended to include the son of the husband's younger brother, provided this son were born before her marriage occurred. Samoĭlovich also mentions the prohibition on using the name of an elder brother's wife which would not hold true if the wives of the two brothers were sisters.[45]

Levshin, in a footnote,[46] says that the husband would never use his wife's name in speaking to another person. I do not know of any other reference to such an avoidance.

606. Actual personal avoidance seems to have existed only in a rather attenuated form. Radlov[47] says that the daughter-in-law must not look her husband's older relatives directly in the face and must always give precedence to them.[48] My informants said that it was perfectly correct for the father and daughter-in-law to see one another and converse together although she must of course "behave herself properly."

582. Information on the terminology of kinship which might be expected to throw light on the limits of the group within which marriage is prohibited is at present contradictory and incomplete. In general there seems to have been a great variation in the range of application of kinship terms denoting relatives among whom one might not marry.

A possible interpretation of the apparent conflict between generation and group exogamy may be reserved for later discussion.

SEXUAL IRREGULARITIES

836 585 Kazak views of sexual morality were on the whole quite rigid. Virginity was expected of a bride and the lack of it usually entailed a relinquishment of at least a part of the kalym (bride price) by her father. Levshin[49] says that to the bridal tent

> . . . on attache un cheval couvert d'un harnais de parade et une robe. Le matin, si l'époux a trouvé sa femme chaste et innocente, il met la robe . . . s'élance sur le cheval et arrive triomphant chez

[45] Here again there is a conflict. Grodekov writes (*Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 28–29) that two brothers would never marry two sisters. Kargabaiev said this frequently occurred.

[46] *Description des hordes*, 356.

[47] *Aus Sibirien*, 1: 480.

[48] See also Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 151.

[49] *Description des hordes*, 361–62.

In former times the slaves also formed a numerous group [61] [621]
permanent residents among the uru members, except for such of them as might be ransomed or freed for other reasons. Their children would also be slaves of the same owners. Here, in a [567]
slightly different status, must be included the slaves and maid-servants who formed part of the dowries of wealthy brides. In the unlikely event of their mistress being sent back to her parents they would perhaps return with her.

In a quite different economic class were individuals who, while not blood members of [233]
the group, might own and occupy land for fodder and winter quarters among them.[3] They were mostly rather wealthy cattle owners who were obliged to supplement their hay-fields and to find better or more extensive winter shelter for their herds. In some, and perhaps in most, cases they were related to the uru members through the female line.[4]

Children might be brought up by the mother's group. Grodekov[5] writes: [855]

Children enjoy protection from the mother's tribe when the father's is inactive or absent. In that case when the father is of the tribe of, say, Chumble, and the child is educated by the mother's tribe, Dzhappac, he is called among them Dzhappac [compare Rudenko's statement above] to avoid coldness of relations . . . [but] no one may belong to his mother's tribe.

Grodekov further indicates that a group may have a legal claim on daughters of its female members by birth:

If a father dies without relatives, the children go to the mother's tribe. The son may choose whether to go or not, and may take up a trade but the girl is obliged to go since they claim her by law.

There is no further light on this point. It seems contradictory to other information.

There might be children other than those whose mothers had belonged to the group [597]
adopted by families within it. Usually, however, adopted children were taken from a brother's family, and therefore were by birth uru members. I have no satisfactory information on whether or not they would be considered as uru members if born outside but formally adopted into it.

A wife's kinsmen might in some cases come and live with her in her husband's group. [606]
Grodekov says[6] that a widower may go to live with his married daughter, but only with the permission of his son-in-law. One of my informants remarked that if a girl married well into a rich family her own kinsmen might be expected to spend a large part of their time visiting her.

In enumerating the foreign elements resident among the uru group there must also be [701]
included the free-lance warriors and the Telengut who served the powerful local chiefs and khans.

All the categories mentioned above were more or less permanently attached to the

[3] See also Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 15.
[4] Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 15, 37; Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 214.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 37.
[6] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 35.

/207 cont./

354 The hearth, around which the Kirghiz /Kazak/ love to sit, not only when eating, but also when conversing, is called "otbosy." There is a concept of happiness connected with it, and for this reason a sacrifice is given to it on certain occasions (see wedding).

342 The yurt plays an important role in the life of the Kirghiz
778 /Kazak/. The paternal yurt ("ul'kun chengarak") is considered sacred. Judgments of important /208/ questions affecting the whole clan take place in it. The wife of a son who has received his
[606] allotment is obliged to come to his father's yurt after the birth of a child, to bow there three times, and to put fat in the hearth.
[782] The Kirghiz /Kazak/ often swear by the yurt ("kottukadam uyumde aiz etemen, ar' kimnei uz' de uzike meshet'" -- "I swear by the sacred yurt, my yurt is a temple of God").

Kirghiz /Kazak/ children by a yurt (from a photograph by Bebenin).

342 Any person in a yurt
672 is considered to be under the protection of the master of the yurt, and
[291] [492] [516] to offend the former is to insult the master. It is the custom, for example, to hitch gift animals to the door of the yurt, and if any sort of misfortune results from this (for example, if a horse kicks someone who is passing) the master of the yurt does not answer for it. And if something bad is caused by the horse of a newcomer, the latter answers for this before the court of the biy, since he is required to hitch the horse at the back of the yurt.

342 In general the yurt plays an outstanding role in the life of the Kirghiz /Kazak/, since it is the place where he passes his entire life and where his family relationships and those of his everyday life take their form.

she is physically a part of her paternal family but socially, spiritually, she is already on her way to join her husband. Among the Turks of the eighth century, a man could sell his daughter, provided she was neither betrothed nor married, if he could not otherwise pay the sum levied against him for a crime. These ancient Turks could not sell their wives, but could make seizure in such a case—but only such an extreme case—on the dowry which the wife had brought with her.

Yet a woman is not without rights among the Kazakhs. There is a considerable progression in her social status and personal rights when she advances from an unmarried to a married state, a progression which was true for the ancient Turks as well as for the Kazakhs, their descendants.[1] The modern unmarried Kazakh girl has no property, but on betrothal and marriage she obtains certain property rights. The married woman receives her dowry which she, not her husband, controls. She may reserve it from her husband's estate and make provision for its distribution among her own children, to prevent children of her husband by another wife from falling heir to her property.[2]

The ethnographer Karutz comments that although a woman's family receives a certain amount of bridewealth from her husband's family on their marriage, this bridewealth is hardly commensurate with the cost and care of her upbringing.[3] (For poor Kazakhs bride-service, in which the youth works for the wife's father for a term, may take the place of payment of the bridewealth, but this is not the usual pattern.) One gains the impression that a girl prior to marriage is barely tolerated in her parental home. She is there on sufferance until the day she marries and moves to her husband's home. A woman is a temporary resident in her father's home, a permanent resident in her husband's home. And the long-established member of the Kazakh community, especially if she is a woman, has a position which the newcomer does not. The mother-in-law has superiority over the son's wife.

A woman advances in status when she marries; she advances still further when she bears a son. The marriage arrangement between two Kazakh families is in the nature of a contract, the purpose of which is the passage of a woman from one line to bear sons for another.[4] The terms of the marriage "contract" involve a complex series of exchanges; bridewealth is paid by the boy's family to that of the girl, or bride-service is performed by the groom for the bride's father, a dowry is stipulated, and feasts and sumptuous gifts are exchanged between the families in as many as seven ceremonies. The riches of the exchanges vary according to the wealth and status of the families. Among rich families, each tries to outdo the other in outlay; among the families of moderate wealth, traditionally fixed sums are exchanged; among the poor, the marriage takes place merely through the exchange of a sheep or a kid.[5]

[1]Ilichwin, 1950.
[2]Izraztsov, 1897, pp. 67-70.
[3]Karutz (72), 1911, p. 100.
[4]Krader (78), doctoral dissertation, 1953, ch. 6.
[5]Karutz (73), 1910, p. 38.